DETAILED ACTION

Acknowledgements

1.   Claims 1, and 3-6 are pending for examination. Claim 1 has been amended. The examiner notes new grounds of rejection have been established. This action is made non-final.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2.   The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

3.   Claims 1, and 3-6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Johnson et al. in view of Tran.

   As per claim 1, Johnson et al. teaches automatically, that is, independent of any required human intervention: (see at least, col. 6, lines 44-62; the examiner notes a scanning process with OCR would be an automatic process) i) receiving over a transmission channel an electronic representation of an form that embodies a report concerning at least one parameter from at least one sender, the form having a plurality of data fields each corresponding to an indicator of at least a partial value of at least one of the parameters (see at least, abstract, col. 6, lines 44-62, col. 9, lines 6-36); ii) identifying the

location of the data fields in the received representation of

the image of the form (see at least, abstract, col. 6, lines 44-

62, col. 9, lines 6-36); and iii) both extracting report data

from the report and storing the extracted report data in a

predetermined common format in a memory for subsequent

processing (see at least, abstract, col. 6, lines 44-67-col 7,

lines 1-18, col. 9, lines 6-36); for at least one third party,

storing a set of party-specific rules in the memory associating

the received report with the corresponding third party and

associating at least one fourth party with the sender and with

at least on of the third parties (see at least, col. 5, lines

55-65 and col. 6, lines 20-43); in which the third party is an

agency that communicates with the central computer system using

an agency computer system; the fourth party is a client of the

agency and communicates with the central computer system using a

client computer system, the agency and client being

contractually related entities; the sender is a person referred

by the agency to the client and performs work tasks for the

client; and further comprising via a publicly accessible

transmission network, receiving access requests from the agency

and the client sent through their respective computer systems

for portions of the extracted report data defined according to

the respective party-specific rules, and responding to the

access requests by returning the requested report data to the

agency and client, respectively, including automatically, that

is independent of any required human intervention, completing

any requests for interactive and iterative **review** (see at least,

col. 9, lines 66-col. 10, lines 20), modification, or

annotation, inclusive of the report data by the agency and

client according to each party's respective rules; whereby the

central computer system is an intermediary system between the

sender on the one hand and the agency and client on the other

hand and exposes different interface to the sender, agency and

client (see at least, abstract, col. 5, lines 55-65 and col. 6,

lines 20-43, col. 14, lines 5-25: The examiner notes that

subscribers/providers can all retrieve reports format. There

can be multiple providers accessing multiple forms of data

related to a subscriber.)

The examiner notes Johnson et al. fails to explicitly

teach the time worked by the sender on behalf of the client.

Tran teaches a parameter includes time worked by the sender

on behalf of the client (col. 3, lines 11-15).

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the

time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Johnson

et al. to include parameter includes time worked by the sender

on behalf of the client as taught by Tran. One of ordinary

skill would have been motivated to combine the teachings in
order to provide accurate work related charges, with less errors
due to incorrect data entry and/or misreading of a users hand
writing (see at least, col. 3, lines 15-17).

As per claim 3, Johnson et al. discloses storing the
extracted report data in the memory in a predetermined common
format; before transferring the extracted report data to any
third party, converting the extracted data into a format
specified by the rules associated with that party, whereby their
parties operating different hardware platforms and processing
software may receive and process the extracted report data form
the same memory within the central computer system (see at
least, abstract, col. 5, lines 55-65 and col. 6, lines 20-43,
col. 14, lines 5-25).

As per claim 4, Johnson et al. fails to explicitly disclose
further comprising the step of storing in the memory third-party
annotations associated with the extracted report data.

However Tran discloses further comprising the step of
storing in the memory third-party annotations associated with
the extracted report data (see at least, col. 18, lines 15-16).

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Johnson et al. to include further comprising the step of storing in the memory third-party annotations associated with the extracted report data as taught by Tran. The motivation to combine is the same as claim 1, above.

As per claim 5, Johnson et al. disclose receiving from a third party, a confirmation or rejection indication relating to at least a portion of the extracted, stored report data, and upon receipt of the rejection indication, directing the sender to resubmit a corrected report (see at least, col. 10, lines 36-53: the examiner notes a notification of data would be a confirmation).

As per claim 6, Johnson et al. discloses storing an image of the report as received; via the network, allowing access by the third party to the image, whereby the third party is able to confirm the accuracy of the extracted report data port data form the same memory within the central computer system (see at least, abstract, col. 5, lines 55-65 and col. 6, lines 20-43, col. 14, lines 5-25).

Response to Arguments

4.   Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1 and 3-6 have

been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of

rejection.

Conclusion

5.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier

communications from the examiner should be directed to Asfand M.

Sheikh whose telephone number is (571) 272-1466. The examiner

can normally be reached on M-F 8a-4:30p.

       If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are

unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ryan M. Zeender can be

reached on (571) 272-6790. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is

571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/F. Ryan Zeender/   Asfand M Sheikh
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit   Examiner
3627   Art Unit 3627

/Asfand M Sheikh/
Examiner, Art Unit 3627

12/21/2007